



\$~95

* **IN THE HIGH COURT OF DELHI AT NEW DELHI**
+ **CONT.CAS(C) 1247/2025 & CM APPL. 51068/2025 (Exemption)**
TILAK RAJPetitioner

Through: Mr. Jasbir Singh Malik & Ms. Shytm
Bhardwaj, Advs.

versus

MANISH CHANDER VERMA, SDM ROHINIRespondent
Through:

CORAM:
HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE AMIT SHARMA

ORDER

20.08.2025

%

1. This hearing has been done through hybrid mode.
2. The present petition under Section 12 of the Contempt of Courts Act, 1971 read with Article 215 of the Constitution of India seeks the following prayers:-

“(a) Initiate Contempt proceedings against the respondent-contemnor for willfull and deliberate violation of the order dated 25.1.2025 passed by this Hon’ble Court in Writ Petition (Criminal) No. 112 of 2025 and punish him in accordance with law; and

(b) Pass such other orders or direction as this Hon’ble Court deem fit and proper in the interest of justice and in the facts and circumstances of the case.”

3. Learned counsel appearing on behalf of the petitioner submits that *vide* order dated 15.01.2025 passed in W.P.(Crl.) 112/2025, a Coordinate Bench of this Court had passed the following order:-



“1. This is a petition seeking directions against the respondent No. 2 i.e. the SDM, Rohini to decide the proceedings under section 145 of CrPC.

2. It is stated by Mr. Dabas, learned counsel for the petitioner that the proceedings under section 145 of CrPC have been pending for the last more than 10 years and the same is contrary to the purpose for which section 145 proceedings are initiated.

3. Issue notice. Mr. Ansari, learned ASC accepts notice for respondent No. 3 and states that the delay presumably could be because of the fact that the matter was decided twice and was remanded back twice.

4. However, for the order I propose to pass, I do not think fit to issue notice to the other respondents.

5. It is directed that the concerned SDM shall conclude and pass the necessary order in accordance with law within a period of 12 weeks from today.

6. With these directions, the petition is disposed of.”

4. Learned counsel for the petitioner submits that since the proceedings has not been concluded by the SDM within a period of 12 weeks, as directed *vide* the aforesaid order, the present contempt petition has been filed.

5. In the considered opinion of this Court, the concerned SDM is performing a *quasi judicial* function while conducting the proceedings under Section 145 of the CrPC.

6. If the petitioner has any grievance that the said proceedings could not be completed within a period of 12 weeks, he has an alternate efficacious remedy, which he can take recourse to in accordance with law.

7. This Court finds that the present petition is not maintainable and



therefore, the same is dismissed and disposed of.

8. Pending applications, if any, also stand disposed of.

AMIT SHARMA, J

AUGUST 20, 2025/nk